DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 624 UD 019 914

TITLE	Hispanic Migrations from the Caribbean and Latin America: Implications for Educational Policy, Planning and Practice: Conference Proceedings. ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series, Number 65, August 1979.
INSTITUTION	Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. ERIC Clearinghouse on the Urban Disadvantaged.; Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. National Origin Desegregation Assistance Center.; Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Race Desegregation Assistance Center.; Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Sex Desegregation Assistance Center.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Aug 79
CONTRACT	400-77-0071
NOTE	15p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027 ($5.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Legislation; *Immigrants; Mexican Americans; Puerto Ricans; Residential Patterns; School Integration; School Segregation; Social Discrimination; *Spanish Speaking
IDENTIFIERS	Lau v Nichols

ABSTRACT

This report includes papers by two educators concerning the education of Hispanics in the United States. Jose Hernandez addresses the issues of Hispanic demographic patterns and migration and the implications of these factors for educational planning and policy. Rafael Valdivieso focuses on the Federal role in Hispanic desegregation, discussing debates over the goals and effectiveness of bilingual education, the lack of compliance with the guidelines established by the Office of Civil Rights after the Lau v. Nichols decision, and the high rate of school segregation among national origin (language minority) students. Both papers emphasize the growth in the overall population of Hispanic students and argue that present and future educational legislation and policy must take into account the needs of this minority group. (Author/EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED179624

ERIC/CUE URBAN DIVERSITY SERIES
Number 65, August 1979

HISPANIC MIGRATIONS FROM THE CARIBBEAN AND LATIN AMERICA

IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL POLICY, PLANNING AND PRACTICE

Conference Proceedings

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ERIC® Published by
CLEARINGHOUSE ON URBAN EDUCATION
and
NATIONAL ORIGIN, RACE, AND SEX DESEGREGATION
ASSISTANCE CENTERS

Institute for Urban and Minority Education

Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

UD0 19914

This publication is one in the ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series produced by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education under contract 400-77-0071 between the National Institute of Education (DHEW) and Teachers College, Columbia University. Additional copies will be available from:

ERIC Document Reproduction Service
P.O. Box 190
Arlington, Virginia 22210

Its ED identification number and full ordering instructions will be found in *Resources in Education*, the monthly ERIC abstract journal, or can be obtained by contacting ERIC/CUE.

Copies are also available from the Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027, for $1.50 each.

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to contracts with the U.S. Office of Education and the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgments in professional matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the Migration Studies Center of the Institute for Urban and Minority Education, New York, New York, for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of the Migration Studies Center, the Office of Education or the National Institute of Education.

HISPANIC MIGRATIONS FROM THE CARIBBEAN AND LATIN AMERICA

IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL POLICY, PLANNING, AND PRACTICE
an invitational conference

June 1-2, 1979 — Columbia University

Sponsored by: **ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, National Origin Desegregation Assistance Center, Race Desegregation Assistance Center,** and **Sex Desegregation Assistance Center,** Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Teachers College, Columbia University; and **Institute for Latin American and Iberian Studies,** Columbia University

PROGRAM

HISPANIC MIGRATION AND DEMOGRAPHIC PATTERNS: IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND PLANNING

Speaker: **José Hernández,** Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee; Former Director, Social Indicator Research, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

Discussants: **Jesse Vazquez,** Assistant Professor, Department of Education and Director, Puerto Rican Studies Department, Queens College, CUNY; **Roberto Alvarez,** Research Associate, Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Teachers College, Columbia University

CONFLICT, CONTINUITY AND CHANGE IN CULTURAL PATTERNS AMONG HISPANICS IN THE UNITED STATES: VARIATIONS IN INSTITUTIONS, OCCUPATIONAL AND SEX ROLES

Speaker: **Lloyd Rogler,** Director, Hispanic Research Center, Fordham University

Discussants: **Marta Vega,** Director, Visual Arts Research and Resource Center Relating to the Caribbean, New York City; **Herminio Martínez,** National Origin Desegregation Assistance Center and Sex Desegregation Assistance Center, Teachers College, Columbia University; **Francisco Chapman,** Latin American Studies Program, University of Massachusetts, Boston

THE ROLE OF FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL POLICIES IN DESEGREGATION AND STATUS EQUALIZATION FOR HISPANICS

Speaker: **Ray Valdivieso,** Director, Aspira Center for Educational Equity, Washington, D.C.

Discussants: **Gil Sanchez,** Director, Bilingual Program, New York University; **Peter Negroni,** Community Superintendent, District 12, Bronx, N.Y.

AN ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES FOR HISPANICS: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Speaker: **Carmen Pérez,** Chief, Bureau of Bilingual Education, New York State Education Department

Discussants: **Steven F. Arvizu,** Director, Cross Cultural Resource Center, Department of Anthropology, California State University at Sacramento; **Marietta Saravia Shore,** Associate Director, National Origin Desegregation Assistance Center, Teachers College, Columbia University; **Ana M. Villegas,** Acting Director, Bilingual/Bicultural Program, C. W. Post Center, Long Island University

Herminio Martinez and **Marietta Saravia Shore,** Conference Co-Chairs
National Origin Desegregation Assistance Center
Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

Introduction

The rapid population increase of Hispanics in the United States, particularly the increase due to migration from the Caribbean and Latin America, has had important implications for educational policy, planning and practice. In order to consider these implications, a conference was held in June, 1979 at Columbia University. The conference was co-sponsored by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education and the National Origin, Race, and Sex Desegregation Assistance Centers of the Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, and by the Institute for Latin American and Iberian Studies at Columbia University.

The objectives of the conference were: to provide a forum for leading Hispanic educators to address issues of mutual concern, such as educational equity and bilingual education; to assess current federal policies affecting the education of Hispanics; to encourage greater understanding of the diversity among Hispanics, including differences relating to diverse national origins and socioeconomic situations; and to enable conference participants to express concerns, interact, and develop recommendations for educational policy and practice for Hispanics.

Dr. José Hernández, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, addressed the issues of Hispanic demographic patterns and migration and the implications of these factors for educational planning and policy. Hernández's paper points out that Hispanics in the United States have migrated from many geographic areas, primarily from Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Colombia, and Central America. What becomes increasingly evident is that these are heterogeneous populations characterized by socioeconomic, cultural, and historical differences between the groups which directly affect their attitudes about acculturation, language acquisition, and educational goals.

Hernández describes the Hispanic population of the United States as being very young in composition. Over 30 percent are between the ages of five and seventeen, customarily considered the "school-age" segment of a population. In comparison, the school-age segment of the nation's population is only 23 percent. Hernández examines the implications of this contrast for educational planning and policy making, and he points out that the present generation of young Hispanic adults will likely engender an even larger group of school eligibles during the next twenty years. The significance of these facts for future educational planning are extremely critical, especially for urban school districts.

The paper is perhaps most valuable for its focus on some very important but often ignored facts which affect Hispanic education practices and planning. In describing residential segregation and its limitations for access to a middle-class economic condition, Hernández underscores the fact that no significant change has occurred in the residential concentration patterns of most Hispanics. If anything, he concludes, segregation has increased, especially as the external and domestic migration trends have brought thousands of Hispanics to such cities as New York, Chicago, San Antonio, and Los Angeles.

Dr. Hernández is critical of some of the directions past planning and policy for Hispanics have taken, and his paper challenges schools to assume affirmative roles as social change agents.

In 1975, the U.S. Supreme Court in the *Lau* v. *Nichols* decision addressed the educational needs of non-English-speaking children. In its decision, the Court concluded that school districts are responsible for providing educational programs such as Bilingual and English as a Second Language programs which enable linguistic minority students to participate meaningfully in the classroom. Rafael Valdivieso, director of the Aspira Center for Educational Equity, discusses the issues and the debates over the goals and effectiveness of bilingual education, the lack of compliance with the *Lau* guidelines of the Office for Civil Rights, the role of bilingual education, and the high rate of school segregation among national origin (language minority) students.

In his paper, Valdivieso presents and analyzes statistical data regarding Hispanic achievement and attainment. For example, data indicate that Hispanics who usually speak Spanish tend to have a higher dropout rate than any other group in the country and, in fact, they drop out at a rate three times higher than Hispanics who usually speak English. Valdivieso points out, however, that the relationship between the use of Spanish and a high dropout rate is only correlational and not causal. Other data indicate that bilingual, middle-class Hispanics have slightly higher earnings than Hispanics who usually speak only English.

This paper presents a close scrutiny of bilingual instruction. The author notes that there has been a growth in bilingual education during this decade, but future expansion of the program has been dampened by political and public negative sentiment and nonsupport. With great skill and clarity, he analyzes the unsystematic manner in which the policy on bilingual education has evolved and the consequent program confusion, gaps, and duplications in service.

Hispanic school segregation is compared to black school segregation; Hispanic children are more likely to be attending a predominantly minority school than blacks. Valdivieso's discussion of the pros and cons of desegregation for Hispanic students, as well as its effect on political and cultural consciousness, is very timely.

The future of bilingual education and desegregation of national origin language minorities remains uncertain. As both papers emphasize, the 1980s will see a great growth in the overall population of Hispanic students. Present and future federal legislation must take into account the educational needs of this multi-ethnic, multicultural, and bilingual population rapidly becoming the largest minority group in the United States.

The legal and political decisions of the 1970s have provided a framework for educational change. The current task of educators, researchers, and policy makers is to develop a comprehensive approach that will insure equal educational opportunity for the millions of Hispanic children attending U.S. schools.

Hispanic Migration and Demographic Patterns: Implications for Educational Planning and Policy

José Hernández
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

A major portion of the United States Hispanic population—about two in every three Chicanos and every other Puerto Rican—is now "native born." Many descend from generations of people who lived in this nation long before the recent immigration from the Caribbean and Latin America. Migration has nonetheless been central to their experience through such movements as itinerant farm labor, the urbanization of the Southwest, and settlement in the North Central region and in areas different from traditionally Hispanic America. Today some fifteen million Hispanics are commonly recognized as a national minority, partly a result of geographic dispersion and concentration, as well as the stability and enduring character of their distinctive lifestyle and sense of peoplehood.[1]

The sizable immigration dating from the late 1960s has been an outcome of rapid population growth in the Caribbean and Latin America and permissive legislation by the United States. But the principal background factor remains the largely frustrated hopes among the common people for social and economic improvements in their nations of origin. Since educational attainment facilitates legal entry in the preference system, many of the new Latin immigrants have been professional, technical, managerial, and highly skilled workers.[2] During recent years, the entry of such persons has somewhat diminished, in step with a trend of increased immigration among middle-level workers, typically in sales and clerical positions.[3] The preference system operates inversely for persons with limited schooling and work abilities. For this, among other reasons, a large and growing number of Latin immigrants have entered the United States without official documentation, many with hopes of eventually legalizing their residence if the migration gamble succeeds.[4] For Hispanics generally, these trends have meant diversity and new dimensions in the national political agenda. The change has also enlivened the Hispanic culture, creating a motive and need for such programs as bilingual education.

What are the collective features of the Hispanic population? For example, how many consider themselves to be of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American origin? Are they primarily young, middle-aged or elderly? Do women outnumber men? Are traditional, two-parent/children families typical? Do most find employment and succeed in their jobs? Is there an income gap between Hispanics and other population groups? How extensive are poverty conditions? Should we conclude that Hispanics face greater discrimination than average for people who differ from the identity and lifestyle of the American majority?

Some of these demographic patterns will be discussed in terms of their influence in educational problems and solutions. A more detailed response must await the results of the 1980 Census, which should provide information in greater depth than any recent data source. The many problems involved in the 1970 Census and the limited scope of other data collection activities since then have made it difficult to obtain an accurate, up-to-date evaluation of several crucial issues and the kind of thoroughgoing research possible for other major segments of the United States population. Moreover, proposed improvements in statistical accounting for Hispanics are as frequent a topic of discussion as actual results of scientific investigation.[5]

Fundamental Aspects

One of the basic problems in obtaining valid and reliable information for Hispanics derives from the variety and imprecision of the methods used to identify people as Hispanics.[6] Currently, self-designation according to a specific national origin or ethnic group (Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American) seems to yield the most accurate and meaningful results. Nevertheless, the labels used to identify persons of Mexican origin (Mexican, Mexican American, Mexicano, Chicano) are not fully adequate in categorizing the population, estimated as 6.5 million in recent surveys. It is therefore thought that among the 1.5 million persons who are identified in these surveys as "other Spanish" many are of Mexican origin or descendants of the Hispanic population of the Southwestern United States, once territory belonging to Mexico.[7] If the Mexican origin totals are adjusted for this factor, about 65 percent of the United States Hispanic population can be said to belong to this ethnic category; the percentage is higher if we consider the unknown number of undocumented aliens and problems of statistical coverage having an unusual impact on Mexican Americans.[8]

The second largest Hispanic group is the continental Puerto Rican, making up nearly 2 million persons or more than 15 percent of the United States Spanish origin population. The 3.2 million Puerto Ricans living in Puerto Rico, which is considered an "outlying area" of the United States, are not included in U.S. Census Bureau figures for national totals.[9] Another 15 percent of the United States Hispanic population is about equally divided between persons of Cuban origin and those from Central or South America and the Caribbean. While all of the Hispanic groups are increasing rapidly, the most significant growth rates are among Mexican Americans and persons of Central American, Colombian and Dominican origin. In these instances, recent immigration in substantial numbers has been added to the usual reproductive pattern as a factor in population growth.

Generally speaking, the Hispanic population of the United States is very young in age composition. Except for Cubans (most of whom entered the United States during the early 1960s and are today somewhat older), people of Spanish origin are typically young adults, teenagers, and children. At least half or more of all Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans are under twenty years old and over 30 percent are between ages five and seventeen, customarily considered the "school-age" segment of a population. In comparison, the median age of the total United States population is thirty, and only 23 percent of the nation's population is of school age.[10] The most significant implications of this contrast for educational planning and policy are that Hispanics are represented in larger-than-average numbers among children eligible for schooling and that the present generation of young Hispanic adults will likely engender an even larger group of school eligibles during the next twenty years. While nationally Hispanics of all ages make up less than 10 percent of the total population, in many school districts the enrollment of Hispanic children far surpasses that percentage and will be even greater in future years.

Among adult Hispanics, women outnumber men by about a half million persons—a significant margin, especially in a predominantly young population. The research literature provides little or no explanation, perhaps because of a lack of interest in the topic and the traditional assumption that most immigrants are males. Recent publications on Mexican Americans have documented an increasing trend in immigration among women; this trend has grown to the extent that immigration of women is as frequent as that of men.[11] Researchers are beginning to focus attention on the problems women face in adaptation to the United States.[12] Several studies of Puerto Rican migration have recognized that more women than men have migrated and live in the continental United States, but no detailed explanation is given.[13] In practical terms, this situation implies that many Hispanic women are responsible for households. In fact, the average is higher than that for the total United States population. While less than 10 percent of "white" households are "female-headed," 17 percent of Hispanic households and over 30 percent of Puerto Rican households are so labeled. In addition, Hispanic households are more often composed of people related by family ties—such as cousins and in-laws— than in the majority population.

For educational planning and policy, an important implication is that many Hispanic children eligible for schooling are not living in husband-wife households, ordinarily assumed to describe the family situation of most students. Also, many student households are relatively disadvantaged, since the responsible adult, as a member of a minority group and very often female, may be unable to work outside the home, may have a low-paid job, or may be trying to survive on a limited support basis. The Survey of Income and Education showed, for example, that in 1975 one in six Hispanic women with responsibility for children under age eighteen received support payments, and these averaged less than $2000 annual income.[15]

Hispanic households with both husband and wife responsible for the children have a somewhat stronger economic situation than the one just described. But in comparison with white Anglo households a significant difference becomes readily apparent. In 1977 the median yearly income of Hispanic families was about $5000 less than the average received by white Anglo families. About 25 percent of Hispanic families were classified as living below the poverty level, in contrast with only 9 percent of white Anglo families.[16] Since a greater number of persons —particularly children—make up Hispanic families, this figure implies not just limited income, but a higher dependence on earnings than average among American families.

The economically depressed condition of Hispanic households derives mainly from a limited earning potential. The average Hispanic worker receives about half of the income received by a white Anglo worker and many Hispanics are among the lowest paid employees in the United States. The gap has been traditionally explained in terms of educational differences: Hispanics earn less because they have less formal schooling and qualifications. However, factual evidence shows that the educational difference accounts for only a small portion of the income gap. Limited employment opportunities and discrimination in hiring, wage determination, and promotion are clearly operative in reducing income levels for Hispanics. For example, in the accompanying table the average annual income of Puerto Ricans and white Anglos at peak earning ages are compared according to educational levels. These data show that a Puerto Rican high school graduate earns about as much as a white Anglo with only elementary schooling, and that it takes a college degree for a Puerto Rican to earn as much as a white Anglo with a high school degree. Such discrepancies imply major job disadvantages faced by Hispanics, as revealed by recent studies.[17]

In addition to demonstrating the impact of discrimination on the economic condition of Hispanic households, comparisons such as those above have important policy implications for educational programs. They make it clear that a traditional motive for obtaining the highest degree of schooling possible—namely, the financial reward—is not a strongly convincing argument for Hispanics. If a Hispanic student survives the educational system to high school graduation and makes the further investment of time, energy, and money needed to graduate from college, the likely result will be an economic situation resembling that of his or her white Anglo classmates who did not go on to higher education. While the statistics of inequality are now being refined and disseminated, the realities discouraging children from seeking advanced schooling have long been part of growing up Hispanic in the United States. As a result, the percentage of Hispanics who occupy professional managerial positions is about half of the comparative figure for white Anglos, while work in factories is twice as common among Hispanics.[18]

For students who attain advanced schooling, the key to success is "overqualification," or having more education than white Anglos in order to compete on the semblance of equal terms. Access to a middle-class economic condition may further require overcoming residential segregation, which limits job prospects to those available in areas where Hispanics can find a place to live. One's living arrangements are partly a matter of choice and certain Hispanics have managed to find the accommodations they desire outside the ethnic neighborhoods or *barrios* in cities where many of them live. But generally speaking, no significant change has occurred in the residential concentration patterns of most Hispanics since the recording of factual information on this topic in the 1950 Census.[19] If anything, segregation has increased, especially as the exter-

nal and domestic migration trends earlier mentioned have brought thousands of Hispanics to such cities as New York, Chicago, San Antonio, and Los Angeles.

Arguments that question the segregation of Hispanics are generally based on impressions derived from comparing their residential patterns with those of blacks. The latter are often restricted to central city areas in their realistic scope of living chances, and they respond by occupying a substantial proportion, if not all of the dwellings in a large ghetto. Comparisons are typically made in ignorance of factual evidence regarding the urban ecology of Hispanic residence, which clearly documents the existence of the equivalent of black ghetto conditions in the major cities just mentioned, and others as well. Also, certain aspects particular to the Hispanic experience serve to explain why segregation remains operative in situations more limited than the "large ghetto." For example, in many Southwestern cities having a decentralized or urban-sprawl pattern of settlement, a highly segregated neighborhood of Hispanics may appear "suburban" to an Eastern observer accustomed to associate detached single household units and yard space with a diversified, middle-class environment. In North Central and New England cities where Hispanics make up a relatively small community compared with whites and blacks, they are typically concentrated in urban strips called "buffer" zones by euphemism, implying a social insulation and mediating function between the black ghetto and the rest of the city. In a recent case study of such an area the living conditions of Hispanics were found to be comparable to or less favorable than those in the black ghetto. The barrio researched was one of three Hispanic buffer zones located at the ghetto's fringe.[20]

Instead of asking, "How many Hispanics live in this barrio?" the question should be: "Among Hispanics in this city, how many live in this barrio?" The answer will clarify the nature of social isolation in the segregation of Hispanics, especially where the community is small in comparison to the population of blacks and whites. Outside of certain limited niches, there is very little room for Hispanics in most United States cities where being Hispanic has some social meaning; this would include a major portion of American urban places. Little is known about the way discrimination operates, but certain things are clearly evident; for example, physical appearance may not always be involved. In many cases a Spanish name on the application form or an accent detected in a telephone inquiry will suffice.

The negative consequences of segregation for the schooling of Hispanics have been documented by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights as well as various researchers.[21] Factors closely related to segregation—such as unemployment and poverty among parents, the school system's indifference and the students' sense of social isolation—have been found to explain the unsuccessful performance of Hispanics in formal education. During recent years most research has dealt with the topic of noncontinuance, variously called "drop out" or "push out," which reduced the proportion eligible for higher education to some 25 percent of the original group starting school.

The Aspira study of noncontinuance among Puerto Ricans in twelve cities concluded that the problem was worse where the students were delayed in the usual sequence of schooling, primarily as a result of the practice of leaving them back at least one year as a solution to such things as a teacher's assessment of language and behavioral "problems."[22] The delay was most apparent in Boston and other highly segregated cities like Bridgeport, Hartford and New Haven, Connecticut, and Patterson and Passaic, New Jersey. The Universidad Boricua study revealed further details that link the difficult circumstances of life in Puerto Rican barrios to school performance, particularly in terms of the survival strategies devised by students and their families.[23] Contrary to widely held assumptions, the crucial factors influencing school retention and success were found to be a supportive attitude among teachers (not necessarily associated with "special schools, programs and expenditures") and greater communication and guidance from parents (not necesarily associated with employment, financial status, or educational background).

The fundamental demographic aspects of the Hispanic population in the United States can be summarized as follows. It is a rapidly growing, predominantly young population with many children eligible for school who will compose the major portion of its people by year 2000. More women than men make up the parent generation and the "husband-wife-and-children" household pattern is less frequent than usual in the United States; still, families are relatively large and cohesive. Most Hispanics are native-born citizens of the United States and have grown up with other Americans in this country's society. Nevertheless, they face inequalities and disadvantages in obtaining an education, employment, and adequate living conditions. The average Hispanic must have more education than other Americans to qualify for the same job and earn the same income. Discrimination is also operative in housing, to the extent that most Hispanics remain living in clearly defined urban sectors often marked by low-quality conditions and typically isolated socially from the remainder of the city. These and many related factors have a depressing effect on the school performance of Hispanic children, resulting in a below-average achievement and a low rate of continuance and graduation at the secondary level. Certain first-order implications for educational planning and policy have been suggested. In the discussion which follows, some of these implications are addressed in the context of the author's professional assessment rather than the results of research.

Average Yearly Income by Age, Comparing Puerto Rican with Majority Males by School Attainment: 1970*

Puerto Ricans, by School Attainment	Average Yearly Income Age 25-34	Age 35-44	Majority, by School Achievement
Less than 5 years Elementary	$ 4,650	$ 5,100	
5-8 years Elementary	5,000	5,450	
1-3 years Secondary	5,850	6,000	Less than 5 years Elementary
High School Graduate	6,100	6,800	5-8 years Elementary
1-3 years College	7,650	8,930	1-3 years Secondary
College Graduate	8,710	10,280	High School Graduate
Graduate Studies	9,710	12,470	1-3 years College
	11,880	17,280	College Graduate
	11,940	19,950	Graduate Studies

Data for New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Majority is defined as "white" persons not of Puerto Rican origin. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, PC (1)-D State Reports.

Discussion

The educational measures that were briefly mentioned (school attainment, delay, and continuance) were researched by the U.S. Commission of Civil Rights for Hispanics and other minority groups.[24] The results of the 1960 and 1970 Censuses of Population and the 1976 Survey of Income and Education were compared to see if any changes had occurred during the 1960s and 1970s. For Hispanics, some improvement was evident; but whatever gains were made proved to be in proportion to the general improvement of education in the United States, particularly when compared with the white Anglo majority. This means that in relation to the rest of American society, Hispanics remain in about the same situation as in 1960, before legal reforms were attempted to strengthen distributive equity and facilitate progress by minorities. Whatever arguments may be made to explain the lack of change, the fact remains that twenty years have passed without any clear indication of a positive trend for the future. What can be said, then, about prospects for more effective planning and policies?

An encouraging aspect of the 1970s has been the development of research documenting the educational problems of Hispanics and serving to explain in an initial way why these problems remain unsolved. The documentation itself has had some impact on school boards, administrators, and teaching staff, particularly in areas where the Hispanic community has pressured the school system to give the issue attention or where the school system has been held accountable through litigation or program evaluation for the conditions documented. To the extent that knowledge of the documentation has raised the awareness of non-Hispanics to the need for solutions and changed their attitudes regarding the nature of solutions, the research effort may have beneficial results for the children in the school system. As in other areas of concern—employment, housing and agency services—things do not begin to happen until the disadvantaged condition of Hispanics is made apparent and a motivating reason emerges for improvement.

In certain limited respects, the direction to be taken in working for improvements has become evident. For example, practices such as leaving Hispanic students back in the grade sequence toward graduation or classifying them as retarded because of language deficiencies should not be used as solutions for learning and disciplinary difficulties. Rather than avoiding the need to provide positive solutions the schools should seek ways of promoting a favorable self-image among Hispanic students, motivating them to take interest in their studies and perform to the level of their abilities. Changes are needed in curriculum, learning materials and (especially) the didactic style and interpersonal relations between teacher and student, school and parents, the school system and community.

Unfortunately, most of the research has not gone beyond these general lines of redirection to specific ways in which the schooling of Hispanics can be improved. This is partly a developmental aspect in that an initial chance to have some influence on the school system depends on the ability to demonstrate gross inequalities and the most severe manifestations of problems. The next step will be to obtain answers to the question often resulting from the initial stage: "If things are as bad as you claim, what can we do to remedy the situation?" In the 1980s the likely emphasis in research will be on policy alternatives and program effectiveness. This may eventually produce guidelines for reform that can be implemented with reasonable assurance that the education of Hispanic children will be improved.

The lack of specific directions for planning and policy can also be attributed to certain controversial issues and conflicting goals in the initial attempts to improve educational conditions for Hispanic children. Litigation for bilingual programs and court-ordered ways of implementing them are among the few strategies available to Hispanics for gaining power in the broader social and political arena. The Hispanic community may also pursue the chance of having bilingual programs of a transitional or remedial nature in hopes of eventually obtaining a curriculum enriched with Hispanic cultural elements and the teaching of the Spanish language.[25] These goals are not easily reconciled with other concerns, such as the possibility that a transitional-remedial program, alone, may be the end result, or, on the other hand, the fear that a genuinely bilingual-bicultural program might become just another means of offering low-quality education or of tracking Hispanic children into a low-status curricular category.

Similar considerations involve the relation between bilingual programs and desegregation efforts. It will be recalled that residential segregation and social isolation are fundamental demographic aspects of the Hispanic population in the United Staes. Again, Hispanic communities are not always "large," nor ecologically situated in ways familiar to administrators concerned with black/white imbalances. This means that if Hispanic children are bused to predominantly white schools, their dispersal may create an obstacle to the adequate development of a bilingual-bicultural program, and confusion may be created in the attempt to assimilate Hispanics as an alternative to a program aimed at developing in them a positive self-image in relation to the rest of society. Desegregation through busing to predominantly white schools may also imply the uprooting of Hispanic children from neighborhood support systems that currently provide about the only operative means to cope with the discrimination and negative factors affecting their future situation in American society.

The unchanging circumstances influencing the lives of Hispanics in the United States perhaps explain best why specific planning and policy directions cannot be readily articulated. In the final analysis, the school is an agent of socialization for the larger society; and if society continues to assign a low and limited position to Hispanics, poor education for them is the likely reslult. The most effective solutions to the school problems of Hispanic children may have more to do with what happens to grown-ups in their aspirations for employment and housing, than what takes place in the classroom. If, for example, it became less necessary for a Hispanic to be overqualified for job competition on equal terms with a white Anglo, Hispanic children would be encouraged to finish school and perform well in their studies. At present, only those showing exceptional abilities are so encouraged.

The unchanging character of the school-work relation is nowhere more evident than in whatever measures of occupational segregation are available for Hispanics. By this is meant the tendency to be over-represented in certain job categories such as farm laborers, factory operatives, restaurant kitchen help, secretaries and recreation leaders—and under-represented in more prestigeous and higher-paid

categories like airplane mechanics, electricians, lawyers, librarians and real estate salespersons. Segregation in certain employment types is partly a matter of regional and historical factors; farm labor is more common in California than in Ohio, migrants to industrial cities tend to become factory workers, and service jobs are more plentiful in the 1970s than in the 1960s. But the primary factor maintaining occupational segregation at the same level for Hispanics during the past two decades has been the strong and widely unrecognized pattern of exclusion from hiring and promotion opportunities. Until such time as Hispanic women and men are given access to the kinds of employment that make a difference in American society, it is unlikely that they or the schools will change in orientation away from preparing children for the low-status positions socially defined as appropriate for Hispanics.

In conclusion, the challenge schools face is that of reversing the relation just described, by assuming an affirmative role as a social change agent. Instead of following the dictates of a discriminatory society, the schools must seek to maximize quality instruction for Hispanics, encouraging children to face the future realities with a background that prepares them not just for survival but for reducing such things as overqualification. To do this, perhaps the most specific directive calls for an open mind to ways of adapting to the needs of Hispanic children—instead of expecting Hispanic children to adapt to a predetermined educational system. The school must be reoriented to favor Hispanic children in their struggle with a racist and oppressive social order—instead of being on the side of the forces keeping Hispanics in a segregated situation. For this to happen, the school system must welcome the Hispanic community to its decision-making process as a genuine participant, ranging upward from outreach and parent-involvement activities at the barrio level to the executive sanctuaries of educational management. The record in this regard is not promising; it shows systematic exclusion, as in many other areas of social life. It is therefore to be hoped that conferences such as this and the dissemination of the presentations and discussions will contribute to an opening of the doors that presently keep Hispanics out of school.

NOTES

1. The population figures cited are drawn from U.S. Census publications. Use of the term ipanic" in this paper follows the conference title and does not necessarily imply endorsement of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare classification system of minorities, which combines "Hispanic" with other ethnic and racial categories and generally discourages use of categories such as Puerto Rican, Cuban, and Mexican American.
2. Charles B. Keely, "Immigration Composition and Population Policy," in *Population: Dynamics, Ethics and Policy* (Washington, D.C.: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1975), pp. 136-143.
3. See Judith Fortney, "Immigrant Professionals: A Brief Historical Survey," *International Migration Review* 6 (1972):50-62; and Ian H. Rockett, "Immigration Legislation and the Flow of Specialized Human Capital from South America to the United States," *International Migration Review* 10 (1976):47-61.
4. See Jorge A. Bustamante, "Undocumented Immigration from Mexico: Research Report," *International Migration Review* 11 (1977): 149-177; Craig Jenkins, "Push/Pull in Illegal Mexican Migration to the U.S.," *International Migration Review* 11 (1977):178-189; and Special Issue on Illegal Mexican Immigrants to the United States, *International Migration Review* 12 (1978):469-558.
5. See U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Counting the Forgotten: The 1970 Census Count of Persons of Spanish speaking Background in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: 1974); U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Improving Hispanic Unemployment Data: The Department of Labor's Continuing Obligation* (Washington, D.C.: 1978); James F. Guyot, "The Puerto Rican Population of New York City: Who Counts Depends on How You Count," *New York City Perspective* 2, no. 2 (1975):1-8; Charles H. Teller et al., *Cuantos Somos: A Demographic Study of the Mexican American Population* (Austin: University of Texas Center for Mexican American Studies, 1977); Jacob S. Siegel, "Collection and Analysis of Immigration Data at the Census Bureau," statement before the Select Committee on Population, U.S. House of Representatives, April 7, 1978; and J. Gregory Robinson, "Estimating the Approximate Size of the Illegal Alien Population in the United States by the Comparative Trend Analysis of Age-Specific Death Rates," paper presented at the annual Population Association of America meeting, 1979.
6. See José Hernández, Leo Estrada and David Alvírez, "Census Data and the Problem of Conceptually Defining the Mexican American Population," *Social Science Quarterly* 53 (1973):671-687.
7. Teller, pp. 13-60.
8. See U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States," *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, no. 329 (Washington, D.C.: 1977).
9. See José Hernández, "La migración puertorriqueña como factor demográfico: solución y problema," *Revista Interamericana* 4 (1975):526-534; and U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Estimates of the Population of Puerto Rico and the Outlying Areas: 1970-1976," *Current Population Reports*, Series P-25, no. 731 (Washington, D.C.: 1978).
10. See U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Persons of Spanish Origin."
11. Thomas Weaver and Theodore Downing, *Mexican Migration* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1976), p. 55.
12. See Margarita B. Melville, "Mexican Women Adapt to Migration," *International Migration Review* 12 (1978):225-235.
13. Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, *Puerto Rican Americans, the Meaning of Migration to the Mainland* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1971), pp. 1-2.
14. U.S. Bureau of the Census, "The Social and Economic Status of the Black Population in the United States," *Current Population Reports*, Series P-23, no. 46 (Washington, D.C.: 1972), p. 68; see also U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Persons of Spanish Origin."
15. U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Divorce, Child Custody and Child Support," *Current Population Reports*, Series P-23, no. 84 (Washington, D.C.: 1979), p. 13.
16. U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Persons of Spanish Origin," pp. 11, 16.
17. See Lois S. Gray, "The Jobs Puerto Ricans Hold in New York City," *Monthly Labor Review* (October, 1975):12-16; Lois S. Gray and Eddie Gonzalez, Jr., "Institutional Barriers to Economic Mobility of Puerto Ricans in New York City," conference report, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, October 13, 1978; Morris J. Newman, "A Profile of Hispanics in the U.S. Work Force," *Monthly Labor Review* (December, 1978):3-14; and U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Puertorriqueños en los Estados Unidos continentales: Un futuro incierto* (Washington, D.C.: 1976).
18. See Newman, "A Profile of Hispanics"; and U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Persons of Spanish Origin," p. 29.
19. See, for example, Terry Rossenbery and James E. Bearden, "Patterns of Residential Segregation and Change among New York Puerto Ricans, 1960-1970," paper presented at the annual Population Association of America meeting, 1974.
20. The Puerto Rican Organization of Wisconsin, *A Survey of the Puerto Rican Community on Milwaukee's Northeast Side in 1976.* (Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin Urban Observatory, 1977).
21. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Mexican American Educational Study* (Washington, D.C.: 1971-1974).
22. Aspira of America, Inc. *Social Factors in Educational Attainment Among Puerto Ricans in U.S. Metropolitan Areas, 1970,* Report No. 1 on Puerto Ricans and Education (Washington, D.C.: 1976).
23. Victor G. Alicea and Julie Mathis, *Determinants of Educational Attainment Among Puerto Rican Youth in the United States,* Universidad Boricua Report (Washington, D.C.: 1975).
24. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Social Indicators of Equity for Minorities and Women* (Washington, D.C.: 1978).
25. National Puerto Rican Task Force on Educational Policy, *Law and Bilingual Education: A Manual for the Community* (New York: Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños, 1978).

The Federal Role in Hispanic School And National Origin Desegregation: Trends and Prospects*

Rafael Valdivieso
Aspira Center for Educational Equity

The continuing debates over the goal and effectiveness of bilingual education, the confusion and lack of compliance with the *Lau* guidelines of the Office of Civil Rights, and the role of bilingual education in the high rate of school segregation among national origin (language minority) students has led to questioning what is and what should be the role of the federal government in satisfying the mandate of equal educational opportunity for school children limited in English-language proficiency as well as those segregated by ethnicity. Secretary Joseph Califano, for one, has ordered a review of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's guidelines (the *Lau* Remedies) for school districts in developing specific voluntary compliance plans to eliminate discriminatory educational practices in the teaching of limited-English-speaking students.

This paper is an examination of the above issues within an Hispanic perspective and context. It begins with a review of the most recent information on the educational status of Hispanics in this country. This is followed by a discussion of trends in the policy areas of language minority (national origin) desegregation and ethnic group school desegregation. The paper concludes with some speculations as to the prospects in these areas.

Hispanic Achievement and Attainment

According to an analysis of the 1976 Survey of Income and Education (SIE), persons with Spanish-language background enrolled in grades five through twelve were about twice as likely to be two or more grades below the grade level expected for their ages as were those with English-language background. Data from the same survey indicated that Hispanics who usually spoke Spanish had the highest dropout rate (45 percent) of any other group in the country. Moreover, Hispanics who usually spoke Spanish dropped out at a rate three times higher than Hispanics who usually spoke English (15 percent). It should be noted, however, that the relationship between the use of Spanish and a high dropout rate is only correlational and not casual.[1]

In fact, another analysis of the SIE data indicates that bilingual, middle-class Hispanics had slightly higher earnings than Hispanics who usually spoke only English.[2] We can infer from these findings that proficiency in two or more languages is not a problem; rather, the problem is that a student cannot achieve if he or she is not proficient in the language of instruction.

As for the academic achievement of Hispanic students in general, the most recent nationwide attempt to study the subject was reported in May 1977. That study indicated that the greatest disparity between Hispanics and the national norm came among seventeen-year-old Hispanics in the Northeast. Scores in social studies were almost eighteen percentage points below average, and in math seventeen points below average. In other achievement categories and ages Hispanics were found to be consistently ten, twelve, fourteen or more percentage points below the national average. The study, conducted by the National Assessment for Educational Progress, also revealed that Hispanics tend to stay in lower grades at older ages than other students. More than a third of seventeen-year-old Hispanics in school were in the tenth grade or below—three times the rate of white students.[3] In general, these findings are similar to the findings on Puerto Ricans and Mexican Americans reported in Coleman's *Equality of Educational Opportunity* published over ten years earlier in 1964.[4]

During the past three of four decades, Hispanic communities have sought possible remedies to the schooling conditions that these disturbing statistics represent. At different times and in different places they have turned to the concepts of school desegregation, community control of schools, and the provision of bilingual education.

Language Minority Students

Bilingual education, in its various forms, is really the only universal educational demand that Hispanic communities have placed on governments. While many proponents of bilingual education despair at our present programs, the movement really has been quite remarkable in terms of growth and energy. Still, satisfying the need for bilingual education continues to be an uphill battle. We know that of the official Hispanic population of 11.2 million there are 10.6 million who have a Spanish-language background in terms of either their mother tongue or their home language.[5] We know from another study that there are 1.75 million limited-English-speaking-ability children aged five to fourteen with an Hispanic background.[6] Yet, when we compare the number of students reported as having limited English-speaking ability (LESA) with the latest data (as of March, 1977) on students reported as enrolled in bilingual instruction programs, we find that some states

*A preliminary version of this paper, entitled "The Role of Federal Educational Policies in the Desegregation and Status Equalization for Hispanics," was presented in the conference, "Hispanic Migrations from the Caribbean and Latin America: Implications for Educational Policy, Planning and Practice," held on June 1 and 2, 1979, at Columbia University in New York City.

The author appreciates the helpful comments that Drs. Eva Gavillan, Ricardo Fernandez, Peter Negroni, Gil Sanchez, and Isaura Santiago made in reference to earlier versions of this paper.

such as California, Massachusetts, and Texas provided bilingual instruction to 50 percent or more of their LESA students, but other states, including New York, provided such an education to only 20 percent or less of their LESA students. In total, only 40 percent of reported LESA students were enrolled in bilingual instruction programs.[7] If we were to use the LESA category today the percentage would be probably higher. However, with the passage of the Education Amendments of 1978, the LESA category was replaced by the limited-English-proficiency category, which includes students having sufficient difficulty in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language that they are unable to learn successfully in classrooms where the language of instruction is English.[8] This new category expands the scope of persons who could be receiving bilingual instruction. In addition, it will require reassessments of both who should be receiving such instruction as well as who, in fact, is already receiving such instruction.

Undeniably, then, there has been a substantial growth in bilingual education during this decade, although there is still a need for more. There are at least two major reasons for not expecting too much further expansion in the immediate future. One is that such expansion would cost more money and cause more headaches—all for a goal or an objective many federal officials claim has no solid research to support it. The second reason is really much more ambiguous but has to do with an apparently widespread American belief that the support of any language instruction besides English will cause societal fragmentation.[9]

This is probably why our country has failed to develop a national language policy that encourages the use of languages other than English. Language, of course, is related to culture; language can't be separated from culture. The structures and functions of language and culture are in a basic sense determined by the bearers. As Shirley Brice Heath has said, any language policy is in effect a cultural policy that calls for changes in the quality of cultural developments in the life of specific groups of the nation.[10] She adds that this is why any language policy must have at its center a notion that culture and language derive in large part from the communities that bear them; policy cannot be planned to yield a set of designated results that may not fit the needs and goals of communities. The general American indifference and, often, intolerance towards the nurture of other languages and cultures are, of course, at odds with the bilingual/bicultural aspirations of many Hispanic communities.

The clash in attitudes and aspirations has also affected the federal policy for bilingual education. The original title VII legislation in 1968 supported bilingual/bicultural instruction in the child's native language. Then in 1974 the legislation was amended to include only bilingual transitional programs which are designed to give instruction in the child's native language while intensive instruction in English takes place. The purpose of such programs is to mainstream the child into the regular school program as soon as possible, while ensuring that the child suffers no disadvantage in achievement in the regular areas of the curriculum. The new 1978 amendments, while still focusing on transitional bilingual education, allow the districts to use their Title VII funds for complying with Federal or state court-mandated bilingual education.[11] Because policy on bilingual education has evolved in an unsystematic manner, many of the policy elements conflict and are the source of a good deal of program confusion as well as gaps and duplications in services.

A brief mention of several issues will illustrate some of these problems. For example, a school district can receive Title VII monies for bilingual classes and still not be in compliance with the "Lau Remedies" of the Office of Civil Rights. To take another example, until the new amendments were passed, the supplement/supplant provision of Title I did not allow funding for a district that was attempting to comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act when a court had made a (Lau) finding that the district had to provide additional language instruction. The objectives of the Lau assistance centers under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act are not always clear. Is the assistance intended to facilitate the desegregation of national origin minorities? Is it to promote affirmative steps to rectify the language deficiency of target students? Or is it to stimulate the provision of high quality programs of bilingual education?

Next year the Title VII program office will administer the Emergency School Assistance Act Bilingual Program, which assists districts undergoing racial desegregation to meet the needs of limited-English-speaking students. This means that the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) will be closely examining the Civil Rights compliance of one set of Title VII grant applicants but not that of the regular Title VII applicants.

The Office of Civil Rights has been neither swift nor effective in its Title VI (Lau) enforcement policy. For the last few years, OCR has been involved in analyzing forms and determining whether school districts were in compliance with the Lau Remedies, which essentially require school districts to have bilingual programs whenever there are twenty or more limited-English-speaking children in their districts.

There are 334 Lau districts in the country. One hundred and two of them were originally found in compliance and 191 plans have been accepted as of January 19, 1979. At this point we really do not know enough about the effect of both the planning on the part of the districts and the involvement of the Office of Civil Rights on creating change in these districts.

In sum, we can refer to the bilingual education policy-making of the past fifteen years as the "muddling through" variety of policy making.[12] There is, however, a growing awareness in the highest circles of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare that something is wrong in terms of an overall coordinated policy. Reform is obviously needed, but the question arises: in which direction will the reform go? The outcry of the AIR report and the journalistic assaults on bilingual education cannot but deeply concern any advocate for bilingual education.

When I consider these different policy elements I am struck by a paradox. Some federal officials seem interested in the rapid assimilation of limited-English-proficient children into the American mainstream while at the same time ignoring the neglect and discrimination that keep these children and their parents from entering the American mainstream. They see language and culture as obsticles to assimilation; consequently they want children to abandon what is inherently an asset and potentially a societal asset. This is like saying that participation in the larger society requires the sacrifice of certain values. In fact, persons should not have to deny who they are in order

to get the basic things they need in life. Yet, these officials do little in terms of removing the negative forces involved in the ghettoization of poor Hispanics. Specifically, I am referring to the tremendous school segregation of Hispanics, especially Puerto Ricans, and its effect on the life chances of these children.

Ethnic Group Isolation

While the need for and the goals of bilingual education have been national issues for the last few years, there is only the barest awareness of the degree and the possible consequences of Hispanic school segregation in this country. Actually, the minority group isolation of Mexican Americans was established in at least two federal court cases earlier in this decade.[13] The desegregation efforts of both Northern blacks and Mexican Americans were greatly diminished during the Nixon-Ford years and have simply not regained their momentum. In the case of Mexican Americans, there was a conscious decision to drop desegregation efforts and instead concentrate on attaining bilingual/bicultural programs in school systems that were under court orders to desegregate their schools in response to court petition by black groups.[14]

While the case of the school desegregation of Puerto Ricans as an ethnic group was hardly raised in the courts earlier in the decade, their legal representatives, like the Mexican Americans, also adhered to the principle of "piggy-backing" their efforts for bilingual education on the black efforts for desegregation. These combined efforts did lead to more bilingual instruction, but they could hardly account, as some have claimed, for the high degree of Hispanic school segregation that was first reported on a national level in 1977.[15] In other words, most of the Hispanic student population was already segregated or well on its way to a segregated condition before the advent of bilingual education; these students would have been in segregated school situations whether or not there had been bilingual education programs.

We will have more information on this subject by the end of the year when Aspira of America will have completed the most comprehensive analysis ever of Hispanic school segregation. Under the direction of Abdin Noboa, the Project Staff has been studying segregation trends in the major school districts with large Hispanic enrollment for the years 1968 through 1976. Already the preliminary project reports confirm a much smaller study completed by Aspira in 1977.

In that study, Aspira used Office of Civil Rights data from 1970 and 1974 to determine that Hispanic children were as likely as black children to be attending predominantly (defined as 50 percent or more) minority schools in a segregation pattern that was stable and growing in every region of the country where there was a concentration of Hispanics. This pattern occurred during a period when the corresponding national rate for blacks was declining. In 1970, 70.6 percent of all black children in the nation attended schools that were predominantly minority public schools; the figure for 1974 was 66.8 percent. Comparable national figures for Hispanics were 64 percent in 1970 and 67.4 percent in 1974. The highest rates of segregation were found in the Northeast. Specifically, in 1970 78.7 percent of all black students attended predominantly minority schools, and in 1974, 81 percent attended such schools. For Hispanics the rate was 84.2 percent for the same two years. The situation was even more striking for Hispanics in New York City, which contains well over half of the national Puerto Rican population. The proportion of Hispanic children in intensely segregated schools (defined as 90-100 percent minority enrollment) climbed from 57.5 percent in 1970 to 67 percent in 1973.

The reader may well ask: What is the significance of these statistics? How does school segregation affect the outlook and world-view of the Hispanic child? Does segregation mean attending inferior schools with ineffective teachers, inadequate facilities, and poor resources? Does segregation affect the achievement of Hispanic students? Further, won't desegregation dilute the critical mass needed to develop political consciousness and mobilization? Won't many Hispanic parents resist desegregation since most are known to be for neighborhood schools and against busing? The answers to all of these questions will require a great deal of study, including action research and discussions among parents and community leaders.

There is a recent report that sheds light as well as raises questions on how segregation may be affecting Hispanic high school students. Rita E. Mahard conducted an analysis with data from the 1972 National Longitudinal Survey in which she examined the impact of high school racial composition on the academic achievement, college attendance and survival of three Hispanic minority groups: Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans and "Other" Latins. Her analyses indicated that Puerto Ricans showed significantly higher achievement and a strong tendency towards higher college attendance rates when they attended predominantly Anglo high schools. Other Latins also showed a positive effect in achievement when they attended higher-percentage Anglo schools, but the pattern was significant only in the West. Her largest sample, Mexican Americans, showed a zero effect on all dependent variables.[17]

While Mahard's study is provocative, it is, as she points out, of a preliminary nature. More research will be required in this area before we can draw any definite conclusions.

Prospects

The discussion in this paper has been restricted to the trends within two fundamental issues which the federal government has a legal obligation to resolve: the desegregation of both national origin or language minorities and racial/ethnic minorities whenever it can be shown that they have been deprived of equality of educational opportunity. In response to widespread discontent from various quarters over compliance with the Lau Remedies, the Office of Health, Education and Welfare is currently reconsidering its position. This reconsideration may lead to a new configuration of programs. In any event, HEW will probably develop a coordinated approach by the end of this calendar year.

But some will be disappointed by the new approach because there probably will be a move toward using Title VII as an entitlement program based on need rather than toward sponsoring the development of excellence in bilingual programs as the primary goal. In other words, Title VII, the various efforts in technical assistance for civil rights complicance, and other bilingual activities might eventually be organized under the overarching principle of

language minority or national origin desegregation. Congress has already amended the Title VII leglislation during the past year to allow the use of Title VII funds for Lau compliance plans.

This orientation de-emphasizes bilingual education as a goal and allows for consideration of additional means, such as English as a Second Language instruction and immersion programs, for the student's rapid achievement of English proficiency.

In turning to the subject of racial/ethnic segregation, it may strike some readers as curious that the two apparently separate issues of providing an adequate education to language minority students as well as desegregating Hispanic students are discussed in the same context. There is a good deal of overlap, as many Hispanic students are affected by policies in both areas. Actually, however, the two areas are joined mainly as a result of historical reasons. A mistaken assumption that has prevailed is the notion that providing remedies in one area will lead to a negative effect in the other area. For example, it has been feared that racial or ethnic desegregation will result in a dispersal of students who need bilingual education—to the point that not enough students will be available for bilingual instruction. But solutions can be and actually have been devised to meet both goals.

We will need to know as much as we can about these areas because as the overall percentage of Hispanic students dramatically increases during the 1980s, especially in urban areas, the dimensions and effects of minority group segregation will become more critical. Unlike the issues involving limited-English-proficient-students, which have been discussed, debated, and fought over, the contemporary issues involving Hispanic school segregation have hardly been defined.

NOTES

1. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, "The Educational Disadvantages of Language Minority Persons in the United States, Spring, 1976," NCES Bulletin 78B-4 (Washington, D.C.: July 1978), p. 3.
2. From work in progress by Calvin Veltman.
3. Robert Crane, "Hispanic Student Achievement in Five Learning Areas: 1971-75," National Assessment of Educational Progress Report No. BR-2 (Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, May 1977).
4. James S. Coleman et al. *Equality of Educational Opportunity* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966).
5. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, "Place of Birth and Language Characteristics of Persons of Hispanic Origin in the U.S., Spring 1976," NCES Bulletin 78B-6 (Washington, D.C.: October, 1978), p. 2.
6. "Study Finds 3.6 Million School Age Children are Limited English Proficient," *Forum*, a publication of the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education 2, no. 6 (June/July 1979): 1-2.
7. *National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education: Third Annual Report* (Washington, D.C.: InterAmerica Research Associates, 1977), p. 91.
8. Public Law 95-561, Section 703(a)(1), 92 STAT. 2269.
9. See, for example, "Bilingual Education," in *Congressional Record* (daily) for 2 May 1979, 96th Congress, 1st Session, pp. S5201-2.
10. Shirley Brice Heath, "Bilingual Education and a National Language Policy," in *Georgetown University Roundtable on Language and Linguistics 1978: International Dimensions of Bilingual Education*, ed. James E. Alatis (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1978), pp. 53-66.
11. Public Law 95-561, Section 721(b)(3)(G), 92 STAT. 2269.
12. Sally Bould and Rafael Valdivieso, "The Sociology of Social Policy: Paths Through the Morass," in *Putting Sociology to Work*, ed. Arthur Shostak (New York: David McKay, 1974), pp. 195-205.
13. Meyer Weinberg, *Minority Students: A Research Appraisal* (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1977), p. 287.
14. Gary Orfield, *Must We Bus* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute, 1978), chap. 7, and Ricardo R. Fernandez and Judith Guskin, "Bilingual Education and Desegregation: A New Dimension in Legal and Educational Decision-Making" in *Bilingual Education*, ed. Hernan La Fontaine et al. (Wayne, New Jersey: Avery Publishing Group, 1978), p. 60.
15. Eugene Lowe and William L. Taylor, comps., *Trends in Hispanic School Segregation, 1970-1974* (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1977).
16. Bob Swierczek and Rafael Valdivieso, *National, Regional, and District Population and Segregation Trends Among Hispanic Students, 1970-1974* (New York: Aspira of America, 1977).
17. Rita E. Mahard, *The Impact of High School Racial Composition on the Academic Achievement and College Attendance of Hispanics* (Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, Fall, 1978).

Recommendations

One of the purposes of the Conference on Hispanic Migrations was for participants to have the opportunity to develop recommendations on educational policy affecting Hispanics. During the last session of the Conference, some of the participants suggested that recommendations be drafted on educational policy based on the discussions that had taken place. Accordingly, the following recommendations, which voice some of the concerns expressed during the Conference, were formulated:

1. The process of establishing the goals of education for Hispanics must include input from organizations representing parents' goals. The school is responsible for educating the community as to the options for their children in their school programs.

2. The mainstream school curriculum and structure must be modified, and these modifications institutionalized, so that the needs and strengths of Hispanic students, including their socioeconomic, cultural and language strengths and needs are taken into account.

3. The school curriculum and support services should be sufficiently articulated with the regular school system so that students are prepared to demonstrate basic competencies in literacy, communication, social and cognitive skills in order to enable them to have options: either to compete in the world of work and/or to participate in further education.

4. There is a need in the field of evaluation to establish criteria and assessment procedures for diagnosing students' needs at entry, and evaluating student progress and competencies for success in further education and in the world of work.

5. Evaluations of program must take into account sufficient time for cumulative growth. Students who are evaluated must have been in the program for at least three years.

6. The field of evaluation and testing should include an evaluation of the *process,* not only the outcomes, of bilingual programs.

7. Bilingual/multicultural education should be an option for all, monolingual English speakers as well as speakers of languages other than English.

8. Schools should be responsible for counseling bilingual students. There is a need for articulation between the school and follow-up institutions to place students in jobs in the world of work, or in universities. Businesses and corporations need literate graduates—consider, for example, the Boston model of internships in agencies and businesses.

9. There is a need for systematic articulation of schools with other agencies which relate to the life of the student and his/her family. The school needs to be seen as a community center coordinating day care centers, mental health services, dental care, and health care.